

Examiner Interview

The Attorney for the Applicant and the Examiner discussed the §112, 1st paragraph rejection and specification support for the claims. The differences between the prior art and the present invention was also discussed.

Remarks/Arguments:

These Remarks are in reply to the Office Action mailed March 17, 2004.

Claim 1, 2-13, 11 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 first paragraph for having insufficient information in the specification to support limitations concerning storing cookies in a repository. As pointed out by the Examiner, the present inventions specification on page 3, lines 1-4 states:

After getting the response page, the proxy server first strips off any cookies set by The external web site from the response header. The cookies, owned by a particular session and identified by the session id, are typically stored in a cookie repository for subsequent requests within the session (page 3, L2-17).

This paragraph concerns an example of one embodiment of the present invention. A proxy server can obtain pages from external web sites. Since some of the proxy server's clients cannot use cookies, in one example, the proxy server strips off the cookies set by the external web site from the response header. These cookies are then stored in a cookie repository for subsequent requests within the session. For example, in one embodiment, the proxy server can return cookies to the external web site, since the proxy server stores the cookies based upon the session ID. If the proxy server did not associate the stripped off cookies with a session ID, the proxy server would not be able to provide the correct cookie to the external web site. For this reason, the cookies are stored the cookie repository associated with the session ID.

The phrase "Owned by a particular session and identified by the session ID", means merely that the proxy server is able to provide the correct cookie to an external web site communicating with a client. For this reason, the Applicant respectfully disagrees that there is a contradiction between the specification and the claims. The claims and specification clearly state that the stored cookies are the stripped off cookies from the external web site.

Note that the remainder of the present invention's specification supports this interpretation of the above paragraph. For example, the Summary of the Invention reads as follows:

The present invention is on methods and apparatus that can handle cookies for devices with limited memory capacity.

In one embodiment, this is done by a server, which centralizes cookie handling for browsers on a number of clients. Not only does the invention solve the problem of browsers that cannot handle cookies, the invention also protects the privacy of surfers by hiding their identities.

Note that the Summary of the Invention describes the use of a cookie handling proxy server that centralizes cookie handling for a number of clients. It is clear that from the paragraph mentioned by the examiner, that the cookie handling function of the proxy server can be done using a cookie repository to store cookies from an external web site for clients that are unable to handle cookies.

Claims 1-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wagner 6,085,224 in view of McGee, 6,393,468.

Claim 1 reads as follows:

1. A method to handle cookies in a response Web page requested by a client, the response Web page having a response header, the method comprising:
generating a session id to identify a new session;
stripping off any cookies set by an external web site from the response header of the response Web page and storing the cookies in a repository;
appending the session id to all of the links embedded in the response page; and
sending the modified response page, with the new header, to the client.

Neither Wagner or McGee, alone or in combination include the limitations of claim 1. One of the systems described in Wagner is a conventional system in which cookie data is received from an external web site server and stored in cache memory at the client browser. The web server puts the cookies into the header of a requested web page. The browser can then respond with a request including cookie information, because the cookie data is stored at the client. Wagner describes other systems in which the cookie data is discarded. One system deletes the cookie data from the HTTP header of an incoming file before it is passed to the browser program. An example of this type of system is described in column 2, lines 61-65 of Wagner.

Claim 1 includes stripping off cookies set by an external web site, storing the cookies in a repository and then sending a modified response page to the client. None of the cited references,

alone or in combination include stripping off cookies and then sending a modified page to a client. For example, Wagner describes two different systems in which either the cookies are used normally or the cookies are thrown away. Neither system alone, together, or in combination with McGee would make obvious the above limitations of claim 1.

Additionally, none of the cited references describes appending an identifier to a link. For example, McGee describes replacing a URL information with a number which can be determined by a hash function. For example, in column 4, lines 13-18 of McGee, it is stated that an advantage of the McGee system reference is that the URL identifying information is not provided to the client, so that the client does not know the name of the location of the information of the information server and further items of the information. This would not be the case if the information was appended to the URL as done in the present invention. For this additional reason, the combination of the McGee and Wagner references does not produce the system of claim 1.

Claims 2, reads as follows:

2. A method for handling cookies for a client browser, comprising:
generating a unique session id in response to a request from a client browser;
removing any cookies from a response page for the request and storing information contained in each cookie in a cookie repository; and
appending the unique session id to each URL in the response page before sending the response page to the client browser.

For the reasons discussed above, with respect to claim 1, the combination of McGee and Wagner dose not produce the system of claim 2. Claims 3-13 are dependent upon claim 2 and for that reason and additional limitations of these claims are believed to be allowable.

Claim 14 reads as follows:

14. A method for storing information for a client, comprising:
removing information from a document and storing that information in a repository;
appending an identifier to each link in the document and sending that document to the client, the identifier identifying the information being stored in the repository for the client.


Claim 14 includes the step of removing information from a document and appending an identifier to links in a document. Such a situation is not described, suggested or given a motivation for any of the cited references.

For the above described reasons, claims 1-14 are believed to be allowable is such is respectfully requested.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 6/16/04

By: 
Joseph P. O'Malley
Reg. No. 36,226

FLIESLER MEYER LLP
Four Embarcadero Center, Fourth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-4156
Telephone: (415) 362-3800